

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/818,313	03/27/2001	Chii-Hwang Chang	67,200-392	1765
7590 09/08/2005		EXAMINER		
TUNG & ASSOCIATES			. MOORE, KARLA A	
Suite 120 838 W. Long Lake Road			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302			1763	
		DATE MAIL ED: 09/08/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		•					
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/818,313	CHANG ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Karla Moore	1763				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DESIGNS OF THE MAILING DESIGNS OF THE MAY BE AVAILABLE OF THE MAILING DESIGNS OF THE MAILING	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29. This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro					
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati 9)□ 10)⊠	Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are pending in the appearance of the above claim(s) is/are withdraware claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on 27 March 2001 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination of the oath or declaration of the oath	ewn from consideration. or election requirement. er. a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objected to the drawi	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119	/					
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureate the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is too long. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1-6 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,122,566 to Nyugen et al.
- 4. With respect to claims 1 and 13, Nyugen et al. disclose a method for operating a multi-chamber fabrication tool comprising: providing a multi-chamber fabrication tool comprising a series of chambers (Figure 1, 10; column 1 rows 22-27); first defining for each chamber within the series of chambers a minimum of one fabrication process (the processing is first defined when software which controls the cluster tool is stored) to provide a series of fabrication processes corresponding with the series of chambers, wherein (1) at least one fabrication process is undertaken within more than one chamber (column 9, rows 29-40) and (2) at least one chamber has defined therein more than one fabrication process including the at least one process which is undertaken within more than one chamber (column 1, rows 27-32); then selecting (the chamber may be selected anytime after processing in the multi-chamber fabrication tool has begun as needed, see column 9, rows 23-46) the at least one chamber for processing a substrate while employing the at least one fabrication process which is undertaken within more than

Application/Control Number: 09/818,313 Page 3

Art Unit: 1763

one chamber, the at least one chamber selected to optimize utilization of the multi-chamber fabrication tool(column 2, rows 50-53); then processing within the multi-chamber fabrication tool the substrate while employing the at least one fabrication process which may be undertaken within the more than one chamber.

- 5. With respect to claims 2 and 14, the substrate is employed within a microelectronic fabrication selected from the group consisting of integrated circuit microelectronic fabrications, ceramic substrate microelectronic fabrications, solar cell optoelectronic microelectronic fabrications, sensor image array optoelectronic microelectronic fabrications and display image array optoelectronic microelectronic fabrications (column 4, rows 11-14).
- 6. With respect to claims 3 and 15, the series of chambers comprises at least about 4 chambers (see Figure 1).
- 7. With respect to claims 4 and 16, the series of fabrication processes is selected from the group consisting of vacuum etch processes, vacuum deposition processes and vacuum implantation processes (column 1, rows 22-32).
- 8. With respect to claims 5 and 17, the method further comprises defining a series of chamber constraints for the series of chambers (column 5, rows 40-59 and column 6, rows 16-26); defining a series of process constraints for the series of processes (column 5, rows 40-59 and column 5, row 60 through column 6, row 15); and defining a series of substrate constraints for the substrate (column 5, rows 40-59 and column 11, rows 23-58).
- 9. With respect to claims 6 and 18, in the method, the series of chamber constraints, the series of process constraints and the series of substrate constraints is prioritized through use of an algorithm when selecting the chamber within which is processed the substrate (see Figures 8A-8G).

Response to Arguments

10. First of all, Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion that the final rejection was premature. Nyugen et al. was used in the non-final rejection on 12/17/04 to reject claims 1-6, and then used in the final rejection on 6/1/05 to reject claims 1-6 and 13-18.

Art Unit: 1763

Applicant's arguments filed 7/29/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Nyugen et al. discloses a processing sequence for optimizing utilization that typically begins after processing has already begun in a multi-chamber processing tool, in contrast to Applicant's disclosed invention where optimization begins prior to any processing in the multi-chamber processing tool. While this may be true, Examiner notes however that Applicant's claims recite only that the optimization processing sequence in the multi-chamber tool begins prior to processing in a specific chamber. The specific chamber being one that can be used for a plurality of different processes and is also part of a group of chambers that all perform a common process. This optimization sequence is taught by Nyugen et al. Thus, the Nyugen et al. reference continues to read on the claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karla Moore whose telephone number is 571.272.1440. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571.272.1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Karla Moore Patent Examiner Art Unit 1763 6 September 2005